May 6, 2004

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554 Commissioner Michael J. Copps Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

# Re: Ex Parte Communication in WC Docket No. 96-262

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

On January 23, 2004, the Association for Local Telecommunications Services ("ALTS") and over a dozen of its carrier members submitted an *ex parte* letter¹ regarding our concerns with possible revisions to rules the Commission issued in its *Seventh Report and Order and FNPRM* in WC Docket No. 96-262 ("*CLEC Access Charge Order*").² Those rules established benchmark access rates for competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs") to obtain compensation for originating and terminating long distance traffic. The *CLEC Access Charge Order* was intended as an interim measure to resolve numerous disputes that had arisen between interexchange carriers ("IXCs") and CLECs concerning the appropriate level of CLEC access charges, and also the IXCs' obligation to make timely payments therefor, until such time as the Commission had completed a comprehensive investigation into all forms of intercarrier compensation.

In the *ex parte* letter, ALTS and its members noted that the *CLEC Access Charge Order* reduced CLEC interstate access revenues by 87% over three years by requiring CLECs to reduce their aggregate rates to those matching the ILEC aggregate rates within the three-year transition period. The Commission preserved CLEC flexibility in establishing their access rates, requiring *only* "that the aggregate charges for these services, *however described in their tariffs*, cannot

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Ex Parte Communication in WC Docket No. 96-262 (filed Jan. 23, 2004).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Seventh Report and Order and FNPRM, CC Docket No. 96-262 (rel. April 27, 2001) ("CLEC Access Charge Order").

exceed our benchmark." This bright line rule was intended to provide "a simple determination as to whether CLEC access charges are just and reasonable...."

However, ALTS and the undersigned carriers are concerned that the Commission may be considering retreating from that bright line approach by requiring a CLEC to tariff individual rate elements for its access service. As the Commission is aware, CLECs, by and large, do not break their access services down into discrete elements, nor should they now be compelled to do so. Many CLEC billing systems that bill a composite rate are not programmed for rate-by-rate billing, and such a conversion would be very expensive. The Commission should not muddy the water by adopting an artificial cost-oriented argument that is entirely inconsistent with the CLEC Access Charge Order, which acknowledged that interstate CLEC access rates need not be separated into discrete rate elements because the benchmark access rates were not directly based on economic cost modeling.

The Commission has also recently received submissions from NewSouth Communications, requesting that the Commission reiterate that the comparable ILEC rate, on which the CLEC aggregate rate will be based, includes all ILEC switched access rate elements, rather than isolated rate elements. Specifically, to the extent that a CLEC provides tandem access functionality, the CLEC Access Charge Order allows it to charge for all access elements, even where the CLEC subtends an ILEC tandem. ALTS supports this request in order to provide certainty in the industry and reduce disputes and litigation.

AT&T and MCI have argued that they should not pay for CLEC tandem access functionality if the CLEC subtends an ILEC tandem. The IXCs have attempted to allocate the CLEC access charge benchmark rate among various access cost components (determined with reference to the ILEC's legacy networks, without regard for any alternative technologies or structures) with the goal of reducing that rate by the amount allocated to particular access functions allegedly not performed by a CLEC. The IXC effort to disregard the CLEC's tandem switch is analogous to the ILEC effort to disregard the CLEC tandem switch with respect to reciprocal compensation. The FCC should make it clear that the CLEC is entitled to charge the ILEC aggregate rate regardless of the CLEC's network design. Moreover, because the Commission did not provide a cost analysis of individual rate elements, it would be inappropriate to merely subtract out the ILEC tandem rate from the CLEC aggregate rate, as the IXCs suggest. Finally, as NewSouth describes in its submissions, an IXC could reduce its access costs and improve the efficiency of the network by directly interconnecting with a CLEC to obtain all access services directly from that CLEC.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *Id.* ¶ 55 (emphasis added).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Moreover, for CLECs that expanded through acquisition, tariffing discrete access elements may be problematic. Network architecture configuration may be distinctly different between entities that now constitute one CLEC such that the discrete access elements may vary between access markets. Thus, it makes sense for CLECs to have the option of a unified access rate since it would be very difficult to tariff discrete elements across a CLEC's consolidated footprint.

With the June 21 deadline fast approaching for CLEC access reductions to the ILEC benchmark, ALTS urges the Commission to act quickly on this matter.

# Respectfully submitted,

## /s/ Teresa K. Gaugler

Teresa K. Gaugler
Assistant General Counsel
Association for Local Telecommunications
Services
888 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 969-2587
tgaugler@alts.org

## /s/ Marty W. Clift, Jr.

Martin W. Clift, Jr.
Vice President - Regulatory Affairs
Cavalier Telephone, L.L.C.
2134 W. Laburnum Ave.
Richmond, VA 23227
804-422-4515
mclift@cavtel.com

#### /s/ Julia O. Strow

Julia O. Strow Vice President Cbeyond Communications 320 Interstate North Parkway Suite 300 Atlanta, GA 30339 (678) 424-2429 Julia.Strow@cbeyond.net

# /s/ Joan Mandeville

Joan Mandeville CEO Blackfoot Telecommunications Group 1221 North Russell Street Missoula, MT 59808 406-541-5300 jmandeville@blackfoot.com

#### /s/ J. Jeffery Oxley

J. Jeffery Oxley
Executive Vice President, General Counsel
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.
730 2nd Avenue South, Suite 900
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: 612 436-6692
FAX: 612 436-6792

email: jjoxley@eschelon.com

## /s/ Michael P. Gallagher

Michael P. Gallagher CEO FDN Communications 2301 Lucien Way, Suite 200 Maitland, FL 32751 407-835-0300 mgallagher@mail.fdn.com

## /s/ Marva Brown Johnson

Marva Brown Johnson KMC Telecom 1755 North Brown Road Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043 Office: (678) 985-6220 Cell: (678) 662-1138 Fax: (678) 985-6213

Email: marva.johnson@kmctelecom.com

## /s/ William A. Haas

William A. Haas Associate General Counsel McLeodUSA 6400 C Street SW Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52406-3177 (319) 790-7295 whaas@mcleodusa.com

# /s/ Edward J. Cadieux

Edward J. Cadieux NuVox, Inc. Vice President, Regulatory & Public Affairs 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 500 Chesterfield, Missouri 63017 Phone: (636) 537-5743 ecadieux@nuvox.com

## /s/ Chris Dimock

Chris Dimock
President & CEO
OneEighty Communications, Inc.
206 North 29<sup>th</sup> Street
Billings, MT 59101
(406) 294-4006
cdimock@oneeighty.com

# /s/ John Sumpter

John Sumpter Vice President - Regulatory Pac-West 1776 March Lane, Suite 250 Stockton, CA 95207 209 926-3136 jsumpter@pacwest.com

#### /s/ Mark Jenn

Mark Jenn Manager - CLEC Federal Affairs TDS METROCOM 525 Junction Road Madison WI 53717 Phone: 608.664.4196 Fax: 608.664.4184

email: mark.jenn@tdsmetro.com

# /s/ Jane Z. Delahanty

Jane Z. Delahanty
Assistant Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
U.S. TelePacific Corp. d/b/a TelePacific
Communications
515 S. Flower Street, 47th Floor
Los Angeles CA 90071
213-213-3288
jdelahanty@telepacific.com

cc: Christopher Libertelli

Matthew Brill

Jessica Rosenworcel

Dan Gonzalez
Lisa Zaina
Bill Maher
Carol Mattey
Jane Jackson
Rich Lerner
Scott Bergmann

Tamara Preiss Steven Morris

Victoria Schlesinger